UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

11A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,229	10/14/2003	Jerry Lee Brown	SLA1261	4626

7590 01/16/2007

Gerald W. Maliszewski
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829

EXAMINER	
DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2625	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/685,229	BROWN, JERRY LEE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pawandeep S. Dhingra	2635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *2* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/14/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 2, "a job output" should be replaced with "the job output". Plus, "analyzed attributes" should be replaced with "the attributes of the requested job" to avoid confusion.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the job output". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 10-11, 13-15, 22, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takimoto, US 6,202,092.

Re claim 1, Takimoto discloses a security management system (i.e. job attribute analysis method) for controlling a printer. The system accepting a job request; analyzes attributes of the requested job; and, controls the job output in response to the attribute analysis (see column 1, lines 12-40).

Re claim 2, Takimoto further discloses accepting a job request includes accepting a job with an associated user identification (ID) (column 1, lines 19-22); establishing a list of permitted attributes cross-referenced to user ID (column 1, lines 30-32, note that access to read and modify security data is list of permitted attributes); and, wherein analyzing attributes of the requested job includes comparing the analyzed attributes to permitted attributes (column 5, lines 10-12); and, wherein controlling a job output in response to the attribute analysis includes supplying printer output responsive to the comparison of analyzed attributes to permitted attributes (column 5, lines 14-19) (Note: for more details, please see column 1, lines 12- 49, and column 4, line 64 - column 5, line 30).

Re claim 3, In addition to the elements cited above apropos of claim 1 & 2, Takimoto further discloses analyzing attributes of the requested job includes forming a group of attributes including ordinary print, color print (i.e. color/monochrome), print on both sides, stapler, paper material, maximum number of pages, and document format, and selecting from that group (see figure 3 (a) & 3(b); column 6, lines 14-23).

Takimoto fails to explicitly disclose that group of attributes include paper size, tray, document content, media type, simplex/duplex, and hole punch attributes. However, Official Notice is taken to note that ability to include the paper size, tray, document content, media type, simplex/duplex, and hole punch attributes into the group of attributes is notoriously well known and commonly used in the art. It would have been obvious to include the above mentioned attributes in the group of attributes of Takimoto for the benefit of giving the user increased flexibility and options in terms of security & printer management.

Re claim 10, Takimoto discloses controlling the job output in response to the attribute analysis includes disallowing a job output in response to the attribute analysis (see column 5, lines 14-19).

Re claim 11, Takimoto further discloses sending a notice to a user associated with the requested job, of the controls imposed upon the job output (see column 3, line 59 – column 4, line 3).

Re claim 13, Takimoto discloses a job attribute analysis system for controlling a printer (column 1, lines 7-10), the system comprising: an analyzer having an interface to accept a job request (see figure 1, element 22a) and an interface to supply job control commands in response to analyzing attributes of the requested copy job (see column 3, lines 59 –67) and, a controller having an interface to accept the job control commands (column 4, lines 4-12), an interface to accept the job (column 4, lines 13-25), and an interface to supply a job output responsive to the job control commands (column 4, lines 20-30). (See also figure 2, and column 4, line 64 – column 5, line 45).

Re claim 14, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 13, Takimoto further discloses a memory including a list of permitted attributes cross-referenced to user identifications (IDs) (see column 4, lines 44-49, note that the fixed drive is a memory and the security data base contains the permitted attributes. The printer driver has access to both security and print data, which is cross-referenced to user IDs [see also column 6, lines 33-42]); wherein the analyzer accepts a job with an associated user ID accesses the memory, compares the analyzed attributes to permitted attributes (column 4, line 64-column 5, line 14; column 6, lines 14-23), and supplies job control commands responsive to the comparison of analyzed attributes to permitted attributes (column 5, lines 15-45).

Re claim 15, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 14, Takimoto further discloses the analyzer analyzes a requested job group of attributes (column 5, lines 3-7) including color/monochrome, paper size, tray, document content, media type, simplex/duplex, staple, and hole punch attributes, and selecting from that group (see discussion of claim 3 above).

Re claim 22, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 13, Takimoto further discloses the analyzer job commands include a command disallowing a job output in response to the attribute analysis (see column 5, lines 14-19).

Re claim 23, Takimoto further discloses a printer front panel having a UI figure 4, operating panel 56; column 7, lines 11-13) and an interface connected to the analyzer (see figure 4, elements 42, 51 & 52); and, wherein the analyzer sends a notice to a user associated with the requested job, of the controls imposed upon the job output, via the front panel (see column 3, line 59 – column 4, line 3; column 7, lines 1-17). Note that the user notification is sent from the front panel (i.e. element 53 in figure 4) maintained in the memory of computer (column 6, lines 33-58).

Re claim 25, Takimoto further discloses a client device having a UI (see figure 4, user application 11) and a print driver (figure 4, printer driver 41) with an interface for sending jobs to the printer analyzer (figure 4, element 42, 51 & 52); and, wherein the analyzer sends a notice to a user associated with the requested job, of the controls imposed upon the job output via the client device UI (see column 3, line 59 – column 4, line 3; column 7, lines 1-17). Note that it is apparent that the user will be delivered the notification via the user application 11 of client computer 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4-6, 16-18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Takimoto, US 6,202,092 in view of Kojima et al., WO00/51338.

(The reference by Kojima et al. is a PCT application published in Japanese with a publication date of 08/31/2000. It is therefore qualifies under U.S.C. 102(b). For convenience purposes, the English translation version of the reference with patent no.: US 6,807,388 is used. All the columns and reference citations are taken from this reference - US 6,807,388).

Re claim 4, Takimoto discloses the elements cited above apropos of claim 3.

Takimoto fails to further disclose the document content attributes form a group of document content attributes including restricted text strings, watermarks, and color images, and selecting from that group.

Kojima discloses the document content attributes (column 5, lines 27-32) form a group of document content attributes including restricted text strings (i.e. character strings), watermarks, and color images (i.e. image pattern information), and selecting from that group (see column 5, lines 35-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the print system of Takimoto to include the document attributes disclosed by Kojima et al. in order "to provide a data monitoring method and system that can freely select either the allowance or the inhibition of the copying according to the secrecy management level of electronic data" as taught by Kojima at column 2, lines 25-29.

Re claim 5, Takimoto discloses accepting a job request includes accepting an electronic copy of a job request for printing (see column 1, lines 12-40).

Takimoto does not disclose analyzing a watermark attribute includes analyzing a digital watermark embedded in the electronic copy of the accepted job.

Kojima also discloses accepting a job request includes accepting an electronic copy of a job request for printing (see column 2, lines 25-29). Kojima further discloses analyzing a watermark attribute includes analyzing a digital watermark embedded in the electronic copy of the accepted job (see column 5, lines 35-67).

Re claim 6, Kojima further discloses accepting a job request includes accepting a hardcopy of a job request for copying (see column 4, lines 54-59). Note that it is apparent that the scanner will accept the job request in the form of hardcopy. Kojima also discloses analyzing a watermark attribute includes analyzing a watermark encoded in the hardcopy of the accepted job (see column 5, lines 27-32). Note that, for example, when the copy machine is analyzing a twenty-dollar bill (i.e. bank bill) from 2006, the machine is analyzing the watermark encoded in the hardcopy of the bank bill.

Re claim 16, Takimoto discloses the elements cited above apropos of claim 15.

Takimoto fails to further disclose the analyzer analyzes a document content group of attributes including restricted text strings, watermarks, and color images, and selecting from that group.

Kojima discloses the document content attributes (column 5, lines 27-32) form a group of document content attributes including restricted text strings (i.e. character strings), watermarks, and color images (i.e. image pattern information), and selecting from that group (see column 5, lines 35-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the analyzer of Takimoto to further include the functionality of analyzing the document attributes disclosed by Kojima et al. in order "to provide a data monitoring method and system that can freely select either the allowance or the inhibition of the copying according to the secrecy management level of electronic data" as taught by Kojima at column 2, lines 25-29.

Re claim 17, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 16, Kojima discloses accepting a job request includes accepting an electronic copy of a job request for printing (see column 2, lines 25-29). Kojima further discloses analyzing a watermark attribute includes analyzing a digital watermark embedded in the electronic copy of the accepted job (see column 5, lines 35-67).

Re claim 18, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 16, Kojima further discloses a scanner having an interface to accept a hardcopy of a job for copying (see column 4, lines 54-59). Note that it is apparent that the scanner will accept the job request in the form of hardcopy. Kojima also discloses an interface to supply an electronic copy of the requested job to the analyzer; and, wherein the analyzer analyzes a watermark encoded in the hardcopy of the accepted job (see column 5, lines 6-32). Note that, for example, when the copy machine is analyzing a twenty-dollar bill (i.e. bank bill) from 2006, the machine is analyzing the watermark encoded in the hardcopy of the bank bill.

Re claim 21, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 15, Takimoto discloses a printer front panel having a user interface (UI) to accept a user ID (figure 4, operating panel 56; column 7, lines 11-13) and requested copy job attribute commands (column 7, lines 13-14, note that attributes are stored in security database (column 7, lines 1-8) and by editing it, user can enter desired attributes for the requested job), and an interface to supply the entered user ID and commands to the analyzer; wherein the analyzer analyzes attributes of the requested job by: analyzing commands entered at the front panel of the printer; and, analyzing the document content (column 6, lines 14-23, and see discussion of claim 3 above)

Takimoto does not disclose a scanner having an interface to accept a hardcopy of a job request for printing and an interface to supply an electronic copy of the job to the analyzer.

Kojima discloses a scanner having an interface to accept a hardcopy of a job request for printing (see column 4, lines 54-59, note that it is apparent that the scanner will accept the job request in the form of hardcopy) and an interface to supply an electronic copy of the job to the analyzer (see column 5, lines 6-32).

8. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Takimoto, US 6,202,092 in view of Bauer et al., US 5,819,047.

Re claim 7, Takimoto discloses establishing a list of permitted attributes cross-referenced to user ID (column 1, lines 30-32, note that access to read and modify security data is list of permitted attributes)

Takimoto fails to further disclose additionally cross-referencing permitted attributes to quotas; and, wherein controlling a job output in response to the attribute analysis includes supplying printed output in response to the permitted attribute quota.

Bauer discloses cross-referencing permitted attributes to quotas (see abstract; column 2, lines 60-67), and, wherein controlling a job output in response to the attribute analysis includes supplying printed output in response to the permitted attribute quota (see column 5, lines 3-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to include the quota attributes as disclosed by Bauer into the group of attributes disclosed by Takimoto for the benefit of having a "simplified way of controlling usage of resources of a networked computing system so that network users do not exceed assigned consumption quotas" as taught by Bauer at column 2, lines 56-59.

Re claim 19, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 15, Takimoto fails to further disclose that the memory additionally includes permitted attributes cross-referencing to quotas; and, wherein the analyzer supplies job commands in response to the permitted attribute quota.

Bauer discloses cross-referencing permitted attributes to quotas (see abstract; column 2, lines 60-67), and, wherein controlling a job output in response to the attribute analysis includes supplying printed output in response to the permitted attribute quota (see column 5, lines 3-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to include the quota attributes as disclosed by Bauer into the memory containing the other group of attributes disclosed by Takimoto for the benefit of having a "simplified way of controlling usage of resources of a networked computing system so that network users do not exceed assigned consumption quotas" as taught by Bauer at column 2, lines 56-59.

9. Claim 8, 9, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Takimoto, US 6,202,092 in view of Salgado et al., US 6,112,039 further in view of Lester et al., US 7,072,065.

Re claim 8, Takimoto discloses the elements cited above apropos of claim 3. Takimoto further discloses accepting a job request includes accepting an electronic copy of the requested job (see column 1, lines 12-16), and analyzing document content.

Takimoto fails to further disclose accepting an electronic copy of the requested job formatted in a printer description language (PDL) and wrapped in a printer job language (PJL); and, wherein analyzing attributes of the requested job includes: analyzing attributes expressed in the PJL commands; analyzing attributes expressed in the PDL commands.

Salgado discloses accepting an electronic copy of the requested job formatted in a printer description language (PDL) (column 3, lines 34-40) and analyzing attributes (i.e. print data) expressed in the PDL commands (column 3, lines 43-49).

Lester discloses, "each print job typically comprises a data structure or sequence of data values formatted in accordance with a predetermined protocol such as PCL (printer control language), Postscript, PDF (portable document format, defined by Adobe Systems Incorporated), HTML (hyper-text markup language), PJL (printer job language), etc" (column 2, lines 34-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the print system of Takimoto to include the electronic job requests formatted in PDL and/or PJL electronic as disclosed by Salgado & Lester in order to efficiently communicate with the typical print jobs as taught by Lester at column 2, lines 34-41, and to have an output printing system with a digital copier-printer in a copy-shop environment as taught by Salgado at column 2, lines 30-34.

Re claim 9, In addition to the elements cited above apropos of claim 3, Takimoto further discloses entering a user ID at a front panel (figure 4, operating panel 56) of the printer (column 7, lines 11-13); and, entering attributes for the requested job (column 7, lines 13-14, note that attributes are stored in security database (column 7, lines 1-8) and by editing it, user can enter desired attributes for the requested job); and, wherein analyzing attributes of the requested copy job includes: analyzing commands entered at the front panel of the printer (column 7, lines 14-17); and, analyzing the document content (column 6, lines 14-23; see discussion of claim 3 above)

Takimoto fails to further disclose accepting a job request includes: accepting a hardcopy of the requested job at a printer scanner.

Salgado discloses accepting a hardcopy of the requested job at a printer scanner (see abstract; column 1, lines 5-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the print system disclosed by Takimoto to include the scanner disclosed by Salgado for the benefit of having an "auditing system which enables monitoring of both input scanning and output printing with a digital copier-printer in a copy-shop environment." as taught by Salgado at column 2, lines 30-34.

Re claim 20, Takimoto discloses the elements cited above apropos of claim 15. The combined teachings of Takimoto, Salgado and Lester teaches that the analyzer accepts an electronic copy of the requested job formatted in a printer description language (PDL) and wrapped in a printer job language (PJL), and analyzes attributes of the requested job by: analyzing attributes expressed in the PJL commands; analyzing attributes expressed in the PDL commands; and, analyzing the document content (see discussion of claim 8 above).

10. Claims 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Takimoto, US 6,202,092 in view of Lawson et al., US 6,829,639.

Re claim 12, Takimoto discloses giving an error indication is given if the user does not have the proper authentication to print or modify the requested data (column 5, lines 16-19 & lines 37-40). It also discloses sending a notice to a user associated with the requested job, of the controls imposed upon the job output (see column 3, line 59 – column 4, line 3).

Takimoto fails to explicitly disclose sending a notice to an administrator associated with a printer accepting the requested copy job, of the controls imposed upon the job output.

Lawson discloses sending a notice to an administrator associated with a printer accepting the requested copy job, of the controls imposed upon the job output (see column 1, lines 37-39; column 1, lines 8-13; column 2, lines 37-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the print system of Takimoto to include the user or event notification disclosed by Lawson et al. in order to have an "event notification system operated within a distributed computer environment to provide such notification of these type of events, e.g. changes to passwords, access at a remote terminal by an unauthorized user, or other security breach, to the attention of the system administrator for appropriate action" as taught by Lawson at column 2, lines 58-63.

Re claim 24, In addition to elements cited above regarding claim 13, Takimoto further discloses a network server having an interface connected to the analyzer (see figure 4, elements 42, 51 & 52).

Lawson discloses sending a notice to an administrator associated with a printer accepting the requested copy job, of the controls imposed upon the job output via the network server (see column 1, lines 37-39; column 1, lines 8-13; column 2, lines 37-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to have the print analyzer of Takimoto send the event notifications disclosed by Lawson et al. in order to have an "event notification system operated within a distributed computer environment to provide such notification of these type of events, e.g. changes to passwords, access at a remote terminal by an unauthorized user, or other security breach, to the attention of the system administrator for appropriate action" as taught by Lawson at column 2, lines 58-63.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pawandeep S. Dhingra whose telephone number is 571-270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lateef Marvin can be reached on 571-270-1245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DANIEL SWERDLOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Pd

Pd
December 27, 2006